

## Fecal bacterial losses in runoff from conventional and no-till pearl millet fertilized with broiler litter<sup>☆</sup>



M.B. Jenkins <sup>a,\*</sup>, C.C. Truman <sup>b</sup>, D.H. Franklin <sup>c</sup>, T.L. Potter <sup>d</sup>, D.D. Bosch <sup>d</sup>, T.C. Strickland <sup>d</sup>, R.C. Nuti <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> National Sedimentation Laboratory, USDA ARS, POB 1157, Oxford, MS 38655, United States

<sup>b</sup> Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC, POB 18300, Greenboro, NC 27419, United States

<sup>c</sup> Department of Crop and Soil Science, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, United States

<sup>d</sup> Southeast Watershed Research Laboratory, USDA ARS, POB 748, Tifton, GA 31792, United States

<sup>e</sup> Dow Agrosciences, Dawson, GA 38942, United States

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 23 August 2013

Accepted 24 November 2013

Available online 18 December 2013

#### Keywords:

Water quality

Fecal bacteria

*E. coli*

*Salmonella*

Watering-in

### ABSTRACT

Georgia farmers are increasing preemergence applications of soil residual herbicides to control glyphosate resistant weeds. To improve efficacy these herbicides are often activated by post-application irrigation. Broiler litter is commonly applied to fields before these herbicides. The herbicide wetting-in practice increases surface soil water content and may increase runoff and transport of broiler litter borne fecal bacteria into surface waters during subsequent storm events. Our objective was to determine differences in loads of fecal bacteria, *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* spp., in runoff from conventional tillage (CT) and no-till (NT) systems after herbicides were watered into an Ultisol fertilized with broiler litter. On replicated 6 m<sup>2</sup>-plots ( $n=3$ ) simulated rainfall was applied for 70 min with composite runoff samples collected every 5 min and analyzed for *E. coli* and *Salmonella* spp. Although total runoff volume from the CT plots was significantly greater than from NT plots, no significant differences in total load of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* or the percent of total loads of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* recovered in runoff between tillage systems were observed. Total percentage of *Salmonella* recovered in runoff from both tillage systems was, however, four log<sub>10</sub> orders of magnitude greater than the percentage of *E. coli* that was recovered. Difference in percentage recovered between the fecal indicator bacterium, *E. coli*, and the pathogen, *Salmonella*, underscores an apparent difference in hydrologic transport characteristics of these two fecal bacteria and casts doubts on the efficacy of *E. coli* as an indicator of risk to public health.

Published by Elsevier B.V.

### 1. Introduction

Conservation tillage practices such as no-till (NT) have been adapted in many parts of the United States (Endale et al., 2002). These systems accumulate crop residues and organic C at the soil surface and are effective at increasing water infiltration and reducing runoff and soil loss (Langdale et al., 1979; Bruce et al., 1995; Truman et al., 2003, 2005, 2007). With conservation tillage, broiler litter and other animal manures are commonly surface applied and not incorporated into the soil as with conventional tillage (CT). This practice may increase hydrological transport of fecal bacteria

during storm events with runoff, contaminate surface water with these pathogens, and put public health at risk (Jenkins et al., 2012).

As a management practice, pre-emergent applications of soil residual herbicides require post-application rainfall or irrigation ("watering-in") to incorporate the active ingredient into the soil matrix (Prostko et al., 2001). Watering-in of soil residual herbicides leads to more effective weed control and their reduced runoff loss during subsequent rain events (Potter et al., 2008, 2011). This practice, however, increases soil antecedent water content (AWC). In turn this may increase runoff, sediment and nutrient loss, and enhance the potential of contaminating surface waters with fecal bacteria when rainfall events closely follow watering-in on fields where manures like broiler litter are used as fertilizer (Moore et al., 1995; Vermang et al., 2009). As part of CT and NT management protocols, broiler litter is applied before watering-in herbicides. In addition to the macronutrients N, P, and K, broiler litter contains fecal bacteria such as the fecal indicator bacterium *Escherichia coli* and pathogenic *Salmonella* spp. (Jeffrey et al., 1998). Their transport in runoff to surface water may adversely impact water quality.

<sup>☆</sup> This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works License, which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 662 232 2976; fax: +1 662 232 2988.

E-mail address: [michael.jenkins@ars.usda.gov](mailto:michael.jenkins@ars.usda.gov) (M.B. Jenkins).

Our objective was to test the hypothesis that differences will be observed in loads of fecal bacteria in runoff from simulated variable rainfall events between CT and NT systems after herbicides are incorporated by watering-in.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Study site and rain simulation

The study site was situated in the Atlantic Coastal Plain region near Tifton, GA, USA ( $N 31^{\circ}26'$ ,  $W 83^{\circ}35'$ ) on a Tifton loamy sand (fine-loamy, kaolinitic, thermic, plinthic, Kandiudult) and with a 3–4% slope. Mean annual precipitation is 1200 mm; climate is humid subtropical. Management of the study site (1998–2009) was previously described (Bosch et al., 2012; Potter et al., 2008; Truman and Nuti, 2010; Truman et al., 2011; Franklin et al., 2012). Half of the area was managed in conventional tillage while the other half was in conservation tillage. CT consisted of fall disk ing, spring disk ing and cultivator leveling. Initially strip tillage was practiced that consisted of a 10-cm tilled strip into which a crop was planted. The area in strip-tillage management was transitioned to NT in the Fall of 2009, prior to this study. This involved planting a winter cover crop mixture of rye (*Secale cereal*, 881 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and Austrian winter peas (*Lathyrus hirsutus*, 33.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) on all treatment areas. In the following month of April, 2010 the cover crop was terminated with a glyphosate application. Two weeks later, lime (2.2 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was applied to both tillage systems; this was followed by rolling the cover crop. Three weeks later, the CT plots were plowed and a field conditioner was run over the plots. In May 2010, pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum*, L.R. Br.) was planted. In the NT area the pearl millet was drilled directly into soil covered by the glyphosate killed cover crop. Percent residue at the time of planting in CT and NT treatment areas was 1 and 83%, respectively.

Broiler litter (4.98 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, containing *E. coli* and *Salmonella* loads of 12.8 and 6.9 log<sub>10</sub> cells ha<sup>-1</sup>) obtained from a local poultry production facility was broadcast over CT and NT areas before planting. Previous studies (Jenkins et al., 2006, 2008a) quantified soil background concentrations of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* to be 3–4 log<sub>10</sub> cells kg<sup>-1</sup> surface (0–5 cm depth) soil and not detectable, respectively. Litter applied to the CT plots was incorporated (10–15 cm depth) with a field cultivator. The NT plots were not disturbed. Three replicate rainfall simulation plots (2 m × 3 m) were then randomly assigned to CT and NT treatments at time of planting pearl millet (six 2 m × 3 m plots total). Following a protocol for activating the herbicide, Callisto®, fertilized plots were pre-wetted with 12.7 mm (25 mm h<sup>-1</sup> for 30 min) of well (irrigation) water using the rainfall simulator (Truman et al., 2011).

Rainfall simulations were initiated 24 h after the herbicide was watered-in. Simulated rainfall was applied with an oscillating nozzle that used 80,150 Veejet nozzles (Potter et al., 2008; Truman et al., 2007; Truman and Nuti, 2010) for 70 min at a variable rate of intensity as Truman et al. (2011) described. Mean total simulated rainfall applied to CT and NT plots was 54.7 and 52.8 mm, respectively. The water used for simulations had a pH of 7.0, an electrical conductivity of 0.002 S cm<sup>-1</sup>, and temperature of 22.4 °C.

Runoff was collected at the down-slope end of each 6-m<sup>2</sup> plot every five min in separate sterile, stainless steel containers. Total runoff volumes and sediment loads were quantified (Truman et al., 2011). Twenty-five-mL aliquots were taken from each 5-min interval sample for microbiological analysis and composited for time intervals 0–15, 20–25, 30–35, 40–45, 50–55, and 60–70 min. Ten-mL aliquots were either diluted by additional 10-fold dilutions or used directly to inoculate 90 mL of Colilert substrate as described below. For *Salmonella* determinations the remaining volume of each composited sample was concentrated by centrifugation at

**Table 1**

Mean total applied rainfall, and mean total runoff by tillage practice, and mean percentage of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* recovered in runoff from their respective loads in the litter applied to the conventionally tilled (CT) and no-till (NT) treatment plots.

Treatment	Total applied rainfall (L)	Total runoff (L)	<i>E. coli</i> (%)	<i>Salmonella</i> (%)
CT	328.2 <sup>a</sup>	217.0 <sup>a</sup>	2.07 × 10 <sup>-3a</sup>	25.5 <sup>a</sup>
NT	316.8 <sup>a</sup>	64.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.05 × 10 <sup>-3a</sup>	16.7 <sup>a</sup>

Different letters by means per treatment indicate differences at  $P < 0.05$ .

10,000 × g for 30 min at 5 °C. Pellets from each composited sample were themselves composited and a final volume of 5-mL in sterile phosphate buffered saline (PBS) (Clesceri et al., 1998) was used to inoculate a five-tube, three-by-three 10-fold dilution scheme described below. Thus, determination of the load of *Salmonella* was for the total volume of runoff.

### 2.2. Microbiological analysis

Concentrations of *E. coli* in runoff and broiler litter samples were determined with a commercial Colilert kit (IDEXX, Atlanta, GA) (Jenkins et al., 2008a). This kit represents a defined substrate technology (Edberg et al., 1990), and is a semi-automated most probable number (MPN) methodology. A modification of the MPN method for determining concentrations of *Salmonella* spp. in environmental samples (Jenkins et al., 2008b, 2012) was made: Rappaport-Vassiliadis (RV) broth instead of tetrathionate broth was used. From RV tubes showing growth, 1-mL aliquots were removed and washed by centrifugation in PBS, resuspended in PBS and assayed directly with a TaqMan PCR assay (Jenkins et al., 2012). Most probable number (MPN) determinations for *Salmonella* were calculated by the number of positive tubes with all determinations having improbability ratios >0.0001 (Briones and Reichardt, 1999; Garthright and Blodgett, 2003; Blodgett, 2005; FDA, 2013).


### 2.3. Data analysis

The load of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* spp. in runoff was the product of their concentrations and runoff volume for each respective composited time interval per plot and expressed per hectares. Total loads of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* per tillage treatment were the sum of the loads per sampling time intervals and expressed per hectares. Percent load of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* was determined by: % load = (load of *E. coli* or *Salmonella* recovered in runoff)/(load of *E. coli* or *Salmonella* applied with litter) × 100. Bacterial concentrations were transformed to natural log before performing analysis of variance and regression analyses. Analysis of variance with significant differences ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) between treatments was undertaken with Proc Mixed (SAS, 2004; Littell et al., 2006). Relations between runoff volumes and sediment mass in runoff and *E. coli* loads were analyzed with Proc Reg (SAS, 2004).

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1. Runoff

Significant differences in runoff volumes were evident between the two tillage practices (Fig. 1). Mean total volume from NT plots was >150 L less than that of CT plots (Table 1). As expected, the greatest runoff rates were observed during periods of greatest rainfall intensity (rise, peak, and fall of the hydrograph) which occurred between the 15 and 40 min sampling intervals. In a previous rainfall simulation study, Jenkins et al. (2008a) reported a similar observation for a variable intensity rainfall simulation on a Southern Piedmont Cecil soil. In a prior study at the site used in the




**Fig. 1.** Mean runoff volumes with standard error bars from each 5 min sampling interval from conventional tillage (CT) and no-till (NT) systems.

current study, Potter et al. (2008) also found that wetting-in herbicides prior to applying simulated rainfall significantly increased runoff volumes.

### 3.2. *E. coli*

Based on repeated measurements of *E. coli* in cropped soils (Jenkins et al., 2006, 2008a), the load of *E. coli* applied with the broiler litter to the two tillage treatments was five  $\log_{10}$  orders of magnitude greater than background levels. Given an average soil bulk density of  $1.3 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ , one can calculate a soil density of *E. coli* that was 0.002% of the *E. coli* load applied with the litter. Thus, approximately 99% of *E. coli* in runoff was from the litter application. Although total runoff and runoff rates from CT plots were significantly greater than from NT plots, the *E. coli* loads of the NT plots in two runoff increments between 20 and 35 min were similar and greater than the *E. coli* loads from CT plots (Fig. 2). Significant differences between tillage treatment loads of *E. coli* were observed for the 5–15 and 50–55 min sampling intervals ( $P=0.03$  and 0.04, respectively); no differences between treatment total loads of *E. coli* were, however, observed (Fig. 3). Lack of difference in *E. coli* loads between tillage treatments was also indicated by lack of difference in total percent of *E. coli* recovered in runoff (Table 1). Jenkins et al. (2008a) also showed that total runoff from analogous CT plots were



**Fig. 3.** Mean total load per hectare of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* spp. with standard error bars in runoff from conventional tillage (CT) and no-till (NT) systems.


significantly greater than that from NT plots; significant differences in total loads of *E. coli* were, however, not indicated.

The two tillage treatments may not have affected differences in total *E. coli* loads in runoff. Differences in correlation coefficients of determination ( $R^2$ ) between runoff volume per sampling interval and corresponding *E. coli* loads, and sediment loads per volume of sampling interval and corresponding *E. coli* loads were observed for NT but not CT (Table 2). This tillage difference may be related to soil surface disturbance by tillage (CT) as opposed to no disturbance with NT. Jenkins et al. (2008a) observed a similar difference in  $R^2$ -value between CT and NT plots for broiler litter-borne fecal enterococci rather than broiler litter-borne *E. coli*.

### 3.3. *Salmonella*

In contrast to some studies that included broiler litter applications and in which *Salmonella* was either not detected in litter (Jenkins et al., 2006, 2008a; Omeira et al., 2006) or infrequently detected (Roll et al., 2011), *Salmonella* was quantified in the litter applied in this experiment as well as in runoff. No difference in total load of *Salmonella* in runoff between tillage practices was observed (Fig. 3). Jenkins et al. (2013) quantified *Salmonella* (at  $5.4 \log_{10} \text{ MPN ha}^{-1}$ ) in broiler litter but did not detect it in runoff.

Compared to the percentage of total load of *E. coli* recovered in runoff, the percentage of total load of *Salmonella* recovered was four  $\log_{10}$  orders of magnitude greater (Table 1). This difference in percentage of cells recovered in runoff between *E. coli* and *Salmonella* appears to underscore a difference in hydrologic transport characteristics between *E. coli*, the fecal indicator bacterium, and its phylogenetically related pathogen as has been previously observed (Jenkins et al., 2008b, 2012). This observation may cast further doubt on the efficacy of *E. coli* as an indicator of risk to public health.



**Fig. 2.** Mean load per hectare of *E. coli* per composited time interval of runoff volumes with standard error bars for conventional tillage (CT) and no-till (NT) systems.

**Table 2**

Coefficients of determination values ( $R^2$ ) from linear regression analyses of *E. coli* loads against runoff volumes and sediment loads by conservation tillage (CT) and no-till (NT) systems.

Tillage treatment	<i>E. coli</i> vs runoff volume	<i>E. coli</i> vs sediment mass
	$R^2$ (Pr > F)	
CT	0.158 (0.1025)	0.185 (0.075)
NT	0.556 (0.0004)	0.599 (<0.0001)

## 4. Conclusions

Although the mean runoff volume from CT plots was significantly greater than from the NT plots, significant differences in total load or percent recovery of *E. coli* and *Salmonella* were not observed. Watering-in herbicides enhanced runoff but not loads of *E. coli* and *Salmonella*. Lack of fecal bacterial load differences was likely due to broiler litter incorporation in CT plots which reduced the numbers of manure microbes at the soil surface as opposed to NT plots where microbial losses were reduced because of lower amounts of runoff attributable to greater infiltration. The greater percent recovery of *Salmonella* compared to *E. coli* indicated different transport characteristics between indicator bacterium and pathogen, and provides evidence to question the effectiveness of *E. coli* as an indicator of risk to public health.

## Acknowledgements

The USDA-Agricultural Research Service and the University of Georgia Coastal Plain Experiment Station supported this work. USDA employees Ricky Fletcher, Coby Smith, Margie Whittle, Lorine Lewis, Jess Bolton, Bobby Hagler, Corey Collins, Bryant Luke, Clay Lott, and Shaheen Humayoun provided expert technical assistance.

## References

- Blodgett, R.J., 2005. Serial dilution with a confirmation step. *Food Microbiology* 22, 547–552.
- Bosch, D.D., Truman, C.C., Potter, T.L., West, L.T., Strickland, T.C., Hubbard, R.K., 2012. Tillage and slope position impact on field-scale hydrologic processes in the South Atlantic Coastal Plain. *Agricultural Water Management* 111, 40–52.
- Briones, A.M., Reichardt, W., 1999. Estimating microbial population counts by 'most probable number' using Microsoft Excel. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* 35, 157–161.
- Bruce, R.R., Langdale, G.W., West, L.T., Miller, W.P., 1995. Surface soil degradation and soil productivity restoration and maintenance. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 59, 654–660.
- Clesceri, L.S., Greenberg, A.E., Eaton, A.D., 1998. *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, 20th ed. American Public Health Association, Washington, DC.
- Edberg, S.C., Allen, N.J., Smith, D.B., Kriz, N.J., 1990. Enumeration of total coliforms and *Escherichia coli* source water by defined substrate technology. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 56, 366–369.
- Endale, D.M., Radcliffe, D.E., Steiner, J.L., Cabrera, M.L., 2002. Drainage characteristics of a Southern Piedmont soil following six years of conventional tilled and no-till cropping systems. *Transactions of the ASAE* 45, 1423–1432.
- Garthright, W.E., Blodgett, R.J., 2003. FDA's preferred MPN methods for standard, large, and unusual tests, with spreadsheet. *Food Microbiology* 20, 439–445.
- FDA, 2013. <http://www.fda.gov/Food/FoodScienceResearch/LaboratoryMethods/ucm-109656.htm> (accessed 10.07.13).
- Franklin, D.H., Truman, C.C., Potter, T.L., Strickland, T.C., Jenkins, M.B., Nuti, R.C., 2012. Nutrient losses in runoff from conventional and no-till pearl millet on pre-wetted Ultisols fertilized with broiler litter. *Agricultural Water Management* 113, 38–44.
- Jeffrey, J.S., Kirk, J.H., Atwill, E.R., Cullor, J.S., 1998. Prevalence of selected microbial pathogens in processed poultry waste used as dairy cattle feed. *Poultry Science* 77, 808–811.
- Jenkins, M.B., Endale, D.M., Schomberg, H.H., Sharpe, R.R., 2006. Fecal bacteria and sex hormones in soil and runoff from cropped watersheds amended with poultry litter. *Science of the Total Environment* 358, 164–177.
- Jenkins, M.B., Truman, C.C., Siragusa, G., Line, E., Bailey, J.S., Frye, J., Endale, D.M., Franklin, D.H., Fisher, D.S., Sharpe, R.R., 2008a. Rainfall and tillage effects on transport of fecal bacteria and sex hormones 17 $\beta$ -estradiol and testosterone from broiler litter application to a Georgia Piedmont Ultisol. *Science of the Total Environment* 403, 154–163.
- Jenkins, M.B., Endale, D.M., Fisher, D.S., 2008b. Most probable number methodology for quantifying dilute concentration and fluxes of *Salmonella* in surface waters. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* 104, 1562–1568.
- Jenkins, M.B., Endale, D.M., Fisher, D.S., Adams, M.P., Lowrance, R.R., Newton, G.L., Vellidis, G., 2012. Survival dynamics of fecal bacteria in ponds in agricultural watersheds of the Piedmont and Coastal Plain of Georgia. *Water Research* 46, 176–186.
- Jenkins, M.B., Schomberg, H.H., Endale, D.M., Franklin, D.H., Fisher, D.S., 2013. Hydrologic transport of fecal bacteria attenuated by flue gas desulfurization gypsum. *Journal of Environmental Quality* (in press).
- Langdale, G.W., Barnett, A.P., Leonard, R.A., Fleming, W.G., 1979. Reduction of soil erosion by the no-till system in the Southern Piedmont. *Transactions of the ASAE* 22, 82–86.
- Littell, R.C., Milliken, G.A., Stroup, W.W., Wolfinger, R.W., Schabenberger, O., 2006. *SAS for Mixed Models*, 2nd ed. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.
- Moore Jr., P.A., Daniel, T.C., Sharpley, A.N., Wood, C.W., 1995. Poultry manure management: environmentally sound options. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 50, 321–327.
- Omeira, N., Barbour, E.K., Nehme, P.A., Hamadeh, S.K., Zurayk, R., Bashour, I., 2006. Microbiological and chemical properties of litter from different chicken types and production systems. *Science of the Total Environment* 367, 156–162.
- Potter, T.L., Truman, C.C., Strickland, T.M., Bosch, D.D., Webster, T.M., 2008. Herbicide incorporation by irrigation and tillage impact on runoff loss. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 37, 839–847.
- Potter, T.L., Truman, C.C., Webster, T.M., Strickland, T.M., Bosch, D.D., 2011. Tillage cover crop residue management and irrigation incorporation impact on Fomesafen runoff. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 59, 7910–7915.
- Prostko, E.P., Johnson, W.C., Mullinx, B.C., 2001. Annual grass control with preplant incorporated and preemergence applications of ethalfluralin and pendimethalin in peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*). *Weed Technology* 15, 36–41.
- Roll, V.F.B., Dai Pra, M.A., Roll, A.P., 2011. Research on *Salmonella* in broiler litter reuse for up to 14 consecutive flocks. *Poultry Science* 90, 2257–2262.
- SAS, 2004. *SAS/STAT 9.1 User's Guide*. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.
- Truman, C.C., Reeves, D.W., Shaw, J.N., Motta, A., Brumester, C.H., Raper, R., Schwab, E., 2003. Tillage impacts on soil property, runoff, and soil loss variations from a Rhodic Paleudult under simulated rainfall. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 58, 258–267.
- Truman, C.C., Shaw, J.N., Reeves, D.W., 2005. Tillage effects on rainfall partitioning and sediment yield from an Ultisol in Central Alabama. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 60, 89–98.
- Truman, C.C., Strickland, T.C., Potter, T.L., Franklin, D.H., Bosch, D.D., 2007. Variable rainfall intensity and tillage effects on runoff, sediment, and carbon losses from a loamy sand under simulated rainfall. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 36, 1495–1502.
- Truman, C.C., Nuti, R.C., 2010. Furrow diking in conservation tillage. *Agricultural Water Management* 97, 835–840.
- Truman, C.C., Potter, T.L., Nuti, R.C., Franklin, D.H., Bosch, D.D., 2011. Antecedent water content effects on runoff and sediment yields from two Coastal Plain Ultisols. *Agricultural Water Management* 98, 1189–1196.
- Vermang, J., Demeyer, V., Cornelis, W.M., Gabriels, D., 2009. Aggregate stability and erosion response to antecedent water content of a loess soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 73, 718–726.